

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

IN RE BARD IVC FILTERS
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

No. MD-15-02641-PHX-DGC

This document applies to:
Bruce Alsaker v. C.R. Bard, Inc., et al.
Case No. 2:18-cv-03750

**FIRST AMENDED SHORT FORM
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR
INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS AND DEMAND
FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff(s) named below, for their First Amended Complaint against Defendants named below, incorporate the Master Complaint for Damages in MDL 2641 by reference (Doc. 364). Plaintiff(s) further show the Court as follows:

1. Plaintiff/Deceased Party:

Bruce Alsaker

2. Spousal Plaintiff/Deceased Party's spouse or other party making loss of consortium claim:

N/A

3. Other Plaintiff and capacity (i.e., administrator, executor, guardian, conservator):

N/A

4. Plaintiff's/Deceased Party's state(s) [if more than one Plaintiff] of residence at the time of implant:

California

5. Plaintiff's/Deceased Party's state(s) [if more than one Plaintiff] of residence at the time of injury:

California

EXHIBIT 1

6. Plaintiff's current state(s) [if more than one Plaintiff] of residence:

California

7. District Court and Division in which venue would be proper absent direct filing:

Eastern District of California, Sacramento Division

8. Defendants (check Defendants against whom Complaint is made):

☒ C.R. Bard Inc.

☒ Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.

9. Basis of Jurisdiction:

☒ Diversity of Citizenship

☐ Other: _____

a. Other allegations of jurisdiction and venue not expressed in Master Complaint:

10. Defendants' Inferior Vena Cava Filter(s) about which Plaintiff(s) is making a claim (Check applicable Inferior Vena Cava Filter(s)):

☐ Recovery® Vena Cava Filter

☒ G2® Vena Cava Filter

☐ G2® Express Vena Cava Filter

☐ G2® X Vena Cava Filter

☐ Eclipse® Vena Cava Filter

☐ Meridian® Vena Cava Filter

☐ Denali® Vena Cava Filter

☐ Other: _____

11. Date of Implantation as to each product:

~~On or about 7/11/2011~~ May 4, 2012

12. Counts in the Master Complaint brought by Plaintiff(s):

- ☒ Count I: Strict Products Liability – Manufacturing Defect
- ☒ Count II: Strict Products Liability – Information Defect (Failure to Warn)
- ☒ Count III: Strict Products Liability – Design Defect
- ☒ Count IV: Negligence – Design
- ☒ Count V: Negligence – Manufacture
- ☒ Count VI: Negligence – Failure to Recall/Retrofit
- ☒ Count VII: Negligence – Failure to Warn
- ☒ Count VIII: Negligent Misrepresentation
- ☒ Count IX: Negligence *Per Se*
- ☒ Count X: Breach of Express Warranty
- ☒ Count XI: Breach of Implied Warranty
- ☒ Count XII: Fraudulent Misrepresentation
- ☒ Count XIII: Fraudulent Concealment
- ☒ Count XIV: Violations of Applicable California Law Prohibiting Consumer Fraud and Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practices
- ☐ Count XV: Loss of Consortium
- ☐ Count XVI: Wrongful Death
- ☐ Count XVII: Survival
- ☒ Punitive Damages
- ☒ Other(s): Discovery rule and equitable tolling: (please state the facts supporting this Count in the space immediately below)

Despite diligent investigation by the Plaintiff, he could not have discovered the nature of his injuries and damages and relation to the product at issue until within the applicable statute of limitations for Plaintiff's claims.

☒ Yes

☐ No

By: /s/ Michael S. Kruse
Michael S. Kruse
10 S. Broadway, #1125
St. Louis, MO 63102
314/241-1919 (T)
317/665-3017 (F)
kruse@ngklawfirm.com

4